UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/649,121	08/28/2000	William V. Da Palma	6169-170	7054

40987 7590 07/02/2004

AKERMAN SENTERFITT
P. O. BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER	
BAYARD, DJENANE M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/649,121	DA PALMA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Djenane M Bayard	2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 May 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5-17,20-25,28-40 and 43-47* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5-17,20-25,28-40 and 43-47* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Argument

1. This is in response to communication filed on May 11, 04 in which claims 1-2, 5-17, 20-25, 28-40, 43-47 are pending. The affidavit filed on May 11, 04 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome U.S. Patent No. 6,675,375 to Czajkowski. The applicant's argument has been fully considered and the finality has been withdrawn. A new rejection is hereby provided below. Therefore, this case is made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2,10, 16-17, 24-25, 33 and 39-40 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,363, 421 to Barker et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0169878 to Orenshteyn.

a. As per claim 1, Barker et al teaches a system for remote management of manageable resources distributed across multiple application hosts comprising: an application manager in a first application host; a master agent in a second application host; and, a plurality of mini-agents in remote application hosts separate from said first and second application hosts (See col. 1, lines 24-35 and figure 3); said master agent receiving from said application manager a management a command to perform at least one management operation directed to at least one manageable resource; said master agent communicating said management command to a mini-agent in a remote application host containing said at least one manageable resource (See col. 2, lines 25-

33); said mini-agent commanding said at least one manageable resource to perform, a said at least one management operation responsive to receiving said management command from said master agent (See col. 4, lines 56-59). However, Barker et al fails to teach wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code.

Orenshteyn et al teaches wherein an application host is a software machine configured to interpret compiles machine independent code. (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code as taught by Orenshteyn et al in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order for the source code to arrive to the client in source form (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

b. As per claim 10, Barker et al teaches a method of remotely managing manageable resources distributed across multiple application hosts comprising: in a master agent in a first application host, receiving from an application manager in a second application host a management command for performing a management operation directed to a manageable resource in a remote application host having a mini- agent, communicating said management command to said mini-agent in said remote application host agent (See col. 1, lines 24-35 and figure 3); and, in said mini-agent, performing said management operation on said manageable resource by accessing an exposed member of said manageable resource according to said management operation (See col. 4, lines 56-59). However, Barker et al fails to teach wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code.

Orenshteyn et al teaches wherein an application host is a software machine configured to interpret compiles machine independent code. (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code as taught by Orenshteyn et al in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order for the source code to arrive to the client in source form (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

c. As per claim 16, Barker et al teaches a method for configuring a system for remote management of manageable resources distributed across multiple remote application hosts comprising: starting a master agent in a first application host; starting a plurality of mini-agents in a plurality of corresponding remote application hosts separate from said first application host, each corresponding remote application host containing one of said plurality of mini-agents (See col. 1, lines 24-36); communicatively linking each mini-agent to said master agent; and, registering manageable resources in each remote application host with a corresponding mini-agent, whereby the distributed manageable resources can be remotely managed by an application manager in an application host remote from said remote application host containing the manageable resources (See col. 1, lines 55-65). However, Baker et al fails to teach wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code.

Orenshteyn et al teaches wherein an application host is a software machine configured to interpret compiles machine independent code. (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to

interpret compiled machine independent code as taught by Orenshteyn et al in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order for the source code to arrive to the Client in source form (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

d. As per claim 24, Barker et al teaches a system for remote management of manageable resources distributed across remote application hosts comprising: a master agent in a first application host for receiving from an application manager in a second application host management commands to perform management operations directed to selected manageable resources; and, a plurality of mini-agents in the remote application hosts, each remote application host containing only one mini-agent; said master agent communicating said received management commands to said mini-agents in the remote application hosts; said mini-agents communicating said received management commands to said selected manageable resources (See col. 4, lines 56-59 and See col. 4, lines 56-59). However, Baker et al fails to teach wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code.

Orenshteyn et al teaches wherein an application host is a software machine configured to interpret compiles machine independent code. (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code as taught by Orenshteyn et al in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order for the source code to arrive to the client in source form (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

e. As per claim 33, Barker et al teaches a machine readable storage, having stored thereon a computer program for remotely managing manageable resources distributed

across multiple application hosts, said computer program having a plurality of code sections executable by a machine for causing the machine to perform the steps of: in a master agent in a first application host, receiving from an application manager in a second application host a management command for performing a management operation directed to a manageable resource in a remote application host a having a mini-agent (See col. 1, lines 24-35); communicating said management command to said mini-agent in said remote application host; and, in said mini-agent, performing said management operation on said manageable resource by accessing an exposed member of said manageable resource according to said management operation (See col. 1, lines 55-65). However, Baker et al fails to teach wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code.

Orenshteyn et al teaches wherein an application host is a software machine configured to interpret compiles machine independent code. (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code as taught by Orenshteyn et al in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order for the source code to arrive to the client in source form (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

f. As per claim 39, Barker et al teaches a machine readable storage, having stored hereon a computer program for configuring a system for remote management of manageable resources distributed across multiple remote application hosts, said computer program having a plurality of code sections executable by a machine for causing the machine to perform the steps of: starting a master agent in a first application host; starting a plurality of mini-agent: in a plurality of corresponding remote a application hosts separate from said first application host, each corresponding remote application host containing one of said plurality of mini-agents; communicatively linking each mini-agent

to said master agent; and, registering manageable resources in each remote application host with a corresponding mini-agent, whereby the distributed manageable resources can be remotely managed by an application manager in an application host remote from said remote application hosts containing the manageable resources (See col. 1, lines 24-35 and lines 55-65). However, Baker et al fails to teach wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code.

Orenshteyn et al teaches wherein an application host is a software machine configured to interpret compiles machine independent code. (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code as taught by Orenshteyn et al in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order for the source code to arrive to the client in source form (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

g. As per claims 2 and 25 Barker et al fails to teach wherein aid first application, said second application host, and said remote application host are a Java Virtual Machine ("JVM").

Orenshteyn et al teaches wherein an application host is a software machine configured to interpret compiles machine independent code. (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code as taught by Orenshteyn et al in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order for the source code to arrive to the client in source form (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

h. As per claims 17 and 40, Barker et al fails to teach wherein said first application and said remote host are a Java Virtual Machine ("JVM").

Orenshteyn et al teaches wherein an application host is a software machine configured to interpret compiles machine independent code. (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein each of said first application host, said second application host, and said remote application hosts are software machines configured to interpret compiled machine independent code as taught by Orenshteyn et al in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order for the source code to arrive to the client in source form (See page 2, paragraph [0017]).

i. As per claim 47, Barker et al teaches wherein said master agent acts as a communication intermediary between said application manager and said mini-agents, wherein communication between said application manager and said master agents as well as communications between said master agent and said mini agents utilizes a common remotely accessible communication protocol (See col. 4, lines 6-17)

4. Claims 5-9, 11, 13-15, 20-22, 28-32, 34, 36-38, 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S Patent No. 6,363,421 to Barker et al in view of U.S. Patent application No. 2002/0169878 to Orenshteyn, and further in view of Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extensions White Paper, Dynamic Management for the service age.

a. As per claim 5,28 and 34, Barker teaches the claimed limitation as described above. However, Barker fails to teach wherein said master agent comprises a Java Management Extension ("JMX") communications connector for communicating with said application manager and said mini-agents.

Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension Instrumentation and Agent Specification, v1.0 teaches wherein a Java Management Extension ("JMX") can be utilized for communicating (See page 6).
It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the a JAVA Management Extension ("JMX") as taught by Sun Microsystems in the claimed invention of Barker because the JMX architecture provides and interface for management applications to interact with the agent, distribute or consolidate management information (See page 6).

b. As per claim 6, Barker et al teaches the claimed limitation as described above. However, Barker et al does not teach wherein said master agent comprises: a JMX communications protocol adaptor for providing a protocol-adapted view of said master agent to said application manager.
Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension teaches wherein said master agent comprises: a JMX communications protocol adaptor for providing a protocol-adapted view of said master agent to said application manager (See page 6 and figure 1, Protocol Adaptors and Connectors).
It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate a JMX communications protocol adaptor for providing a protocol-adapted view of said master agent to said application manager in order to give a representation of the MBeans directly in another protocol (See page 6, Protocol adaptors and connectors).

c. As per claims 7 and 30, Barker et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, Barker et al fails to teach wherein said JMX communications connector comprises a Java Remote Method Invocation communications interface.
Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension teaches wherein said JMX communications connector comprises a Java Remote Method Invocation communications interface (See 6, Protocols Adaptors and Connectors).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate JMX communications connector comprises a Java Remote Method Invocation communications interface as taught by Sun Microsystems in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order to provide an end-to end communications with the agent over a variety of protocols (See page 6, Protocols Adaptors and Connectors)

d. As per claims 8 and 31, Barker et al teaches the claimed limitation as described above. However, Barker et al fails to teach wherein each manageable resource has a managed bean ("MBean") interface.
Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension teaches wherein each manageable resource has a managed bean ("MBean") interface (See page 6, JMX Agent).
It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein each manageable resource has a managed bean ("MBean") interface as taught by Sun Microsystems in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order to perform management operations (See page6, JMX Agent, MBean Server).

e. As per claim 9, Barker et al teaches the claimed limitation as described above. However, Barker et al fails to teach wherein each said mini-agent comprises an MBean server exposing said MBeans to said master agent application through a JMX communications connector.

Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension teaches wherein each said mini-agent comprises an MBean server exposing said MBeans to said master agent application through a JMX communications connector (See page 6, JMX agent)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein each said mini-agent comprises an MBean server exposing said MBeans to said master agent application through a JMX communications connector as taught by Sun Microsystems in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order provide instrumentation of managed resources (See page 6)

f. As per claim 11, Barker et al teaches the claim limitation as described above. However, Barker et al fails to teach the method wherein said step of communicating said management command to said mini-agent comprise; accessing said mini-agent through a JMX communications connector.

Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension teaches the method wherein said step of communicating said management command to said mini-agent comprise; accessing said mini-agent through a JMX communications connector (See page 6, Protocols Adaptors and Connectors).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method wherein said step of communicating said management command to said mini-agent comprise; accessing said mini-agent through a JMX communications connector as taught by Sun Microsystems in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order to provide an end-to end communications with the agent over a variety of protocols (See page 6, Protocols Adaptors and Connectors).

j. As per claims 13, 20, 36 and 43, Barker et al teaches the claimed limitation as described above. However, Barker et al fails to teach the method comprising: providing a managed bean ("MBean") interface to the manageable resources through which selected members of the manageable resources can be accessed.

Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension teaches the method comprising: providing a managed bean ("MBean") interface to the manageable resources through which selected members of the manageable resources can be accessed (See page 6, Component of the JMX).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method comprising: providing a managed bean ("MBean") interface to the manageable resources through which selected members of the manageable resources can be accessed as taught by Sun Microsystems in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order to provide instrumentation of managed resources (See page 6, JMX component).

h. As per claims 21 and 44, Barker et al teaches the claim limitation as described above. However, Barker et al fails to teach the method wherein said step of starting a plurality of mini-agents comprises: starting a managed bean ("MBean") server in each of said plurality of mini agents, said MBean server exposing MBeans in said corresponding remote application hosts.

Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension teaches method wherein said step of starting a plurality of mini-agents comprises: starting a managed bean ("MBean") server in each of said plurality of mini agents, said MBean server exposing MBeans in said corresponding remote application hosts (See page 6, JMX Agent)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate method wherein said step of starting a plurality of mini-agents comprises: starting a managed bean ("MBean") server in each of said plurality of mini agents, said MBean server exposing MBeans in said corresponding remote application hosts as taught by Sun Microsystems in order to provide the services allowing manipulation of Mbeans (See page 6, Mbean Server).

i. As per claims 14, 22 and 45, Barker et al teaches the claimed limitation as described above. However, Barker et al fails to teach the method wherein said registering step comprises: registering said MBeans with said MBean server.

Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension teaches the method wherein said the Mbean server is a registry for Mbeans (See page 6, Mbean Server).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method wherein said registering step comprises: registering said MBeans with said MBean server as taught by Sun Microsystems in the claimed invention of Barker et al in order to allow the manipulation of Mbeans (See page 6, Mbean Server).

g. As per claim 15, Barker et al teaches the claimed limitation as described above. However, Barker et al fails to teach the method wherein said step of accessing said method comprises: accessing a member of the manageable resource exposed to said mini-

agent by said MBean through said MBean server according to said management operation.

Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension teaches method wherein said step of accessing said method comprises: accessing a member of the manageable resource exposed to said mini-agent by said MBean through said MBean server according to said management operation (See page 6).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method wherein said step of accessing said method comprises: accessing a member of the manageable resource exposed to said mini-agent by said MBean through said MBean server according to said management operation as taught by Sun Microsystems in the claimed invention of Barker et al because any resources that you want to manage from outside the agent's Java virtual machine must be registered as an MBean in the MBean server (See page 6, JMX Agent)

k. As per claim 29, Barker et al view of Orenshteyn teaches the claimed limitations as described above. However, Barker et al fails to teach the system wherein master agent comprises: JMX communications connector for providing a view of said master agent to a JMX-compliant application manager; and, a JMX communications protocol adaptor for providing a protocol-adapted view of said master agent to an application manager residing in a non-JVM environment.

Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension Instrumentation and Agent Specification, v1.0 teaches the system wherein master agent comprises: JMX communications connector for providing a view of said master agent to a JMX-compliant application manager; and, a JMX communications protocol adaptor for providing a protocol-adapted view of said master agent to an application manager residing in a non-JVM environment (See page 6, Protocols Adaptors and Connectors).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the system wherein master agent comprises: JMX communications connector for providing a view of said master agent to a JMX-compliant application manager; and, a JMX communications protocol adaptor for providing a

protocol-adapted view of said master agent to an application manager residing in a non-JVM environment as taught by Sun Microsystems in the claimed invention of Barker et al in view of Orenshteyn in order to let management applications access a JMX agent and manipulate the Mbeans it contains (See page 6, Protocol adaptors and connectors).

l. As per claim 32, Barker et al view of Orenshteyn teaches the claimed limitation as described above. However, Barker et al fails to teach wherein each mini-agent in a corresponding remote application host comprises a managed bean server ("MBean Server") for exposing MBeans contained in said corresponding remote application host to said master agent through a JMX communications connector.

Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension teaches wherein each mini-agent in a corresponding remote application host comprises a managed bean server ("MBean Server") for exposing MBeans contained in said corresponding remote application host to said master agent through a JMX communications connector (See page 6, Component of the Agent Level).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein each mini-agent in a corresponding remote application host comprises a managed bean server ("MBean Server") for exposing MBeans contained in said corresponding remote application host to said master agent through a JMX communications connector as taught by Sun Microsystems in the claimed invention of Barker et al view of Orenshteyn because Mbeans provide instrumentation of managed resources in a standardized way (See page 6. JMX components)

m. As per claim 37, Barker et al view of Orenshteyn teaches the claimed limitation as described above. However, Barker et al fails to teach wherein said management interface is a managed bean ("MBean") registered in an MBean server in said mini-agent.

Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management teaches wherein said management interface is a managed bean ("MBean") registered in an MBean server in said mini-agent (See page 6, Mbean Server)

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wherein said management interface is a managed bean ("MBean") registered in an MBean server in said mini-agent as taught by Sun Microsystems in order to allow the manipulation of Mbeans (See page 6, Mbean Server).

n. As per claim 38, Barker et al view of Orenshteyn teaches the claimed limitation as describes above. However, Barker et al fails to teach wherein said step of accessing said method comprises: accessing a member of the manageable resource exposed to said mini-agent by said MBean through said MBean server according to said management operation.

Sun Microsystems: JAVA Management Extension Instrumentation and Agent Specification, v1.0 teaches wherein said step of accessing said method comprises: accessing a member of the manageable resource exposed to said mini-agent by said MBean through said MBean server according to said management operation (See page6, JMX agent).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include wherein said step of accessing said method comprises: accessing a member of the manageable resource exposed to said mini-agent by said MBean through said MBean server according to said management operation as taught by Sun Microsystems in the claimed invention of Barker et al view of Orenshteyn in order to allow the manipulation of Mbeans (See page 6, Mbean Server).

5. Claims 12, 23,35 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,363,421 to Barker et al in view of U.S. Patent application No. 2002/0169878 to Orenshteyn, further in view of Sun Microsystems: Java management Extensions as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,633,923 to Kukura et al.

a. As per claims 12 and 35, Barker et al in view of Orenshteyn further in view of Sun Microsystems teaches the claimed limitation as described above. However, Barker et al in view of Sun Microsystems fails to teach the method wherein said step of accessing said mini-agent comprises: accessing said mini-agent through an RMI communications interface.

Kukura et al teaches a method and system for dynamic configuration of interceptors in a client-server environment. Furthermore, Kukura et al teaches the method wherein said step of accessing said mini-agent comprises: accessing said mini-agent through an RMI communications interface (See col. 2, lines 8-13).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method wherein said step of accessing said mini-agent comprises: accessing said mini-agent through an RMI communications interface as taught by Kukura et al in the claimed invention of Barker et al in view of Orenshteyn and further in view of Sun Microsystems in order to use the interfaces to access the server objects remotely from another machine's Java Virtual Machine ("JVM") (See col. 2, lines 8-13).

b. As per claims 23 and 46, Barker et al in view of Orenshteyn further in view of Sun Microsystems teaches the claimed limitation as described above. However, Barker et al in view of Sun Microsystems fails to teach the method wherein said step of communicatively linking each mini agent to said master agent comprises: creating RMI connector servers in said master agent and each said mini-agent; and, creating RMI connector clients in said master agent and each said mini-agent; said master agent communicating with said mini-agents and said mini-agents communicating with said master agent through RMI interfaces created by said RMI connector servers and said RMI connector clients.

Kukura et al teaches the method and system for dynamic configuration of interceptors in a client-server environment. Furthermore, Kukura et al teaches the method wherein said step of communicatively linking each mini agent to said master agent comprises: creating RMI connector servers in said master agent and each said mini-

agent; and, creating RMI connector clients in said master agent and each said mini-agent; said master agent communicating with said mini-agents and said mini-agents communicating with said master agent through RMI interfaces created by said RMI connector servers and said RMI connector clients (See col. 1, lines 53-67 and col. 2 , lines1-29).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method wherein said step of communicatively linking each mini agent to said master agent comprises: creating RMI connector servers in said master agent and each said mini-agent; and, creating RMI connector clients in said master agent and each said mini-agent; said master agent communicating with said mini-agents and said mini-agents communicating with said master agent through RMI interfaces created by said RMI connector servers and said RMI connector clients as taught by Kukura in the claimed invention of Barker et al in view of Orenshteyn further in view of Sun Microsystems because a server to be a RMI server comprises objects that have predefined interfaces, which can be used to access the server objects remotely from another's machine Java Virtual Machine("JVM") (See col. 1, lines 53-67 and col. 2 , lines1-29).

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M Bayard whose telephone number is (703) 305-6606. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 AM-4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER